

REMARKS

No claims have been amended.

Claims 18 and 30 remain in this application. Claims 1-17 and 19-29 have been canceled.

Claims 18 and 30 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hosler, et al.*, (US 2002/0009048 A1, filed December 29, 2000). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicants submit that *Hosler* does not teach, within its four corners, each and every element of, in the detail and the manner of, the claims. More specifically, *Hosler* does not teach the element of “**determining when the source identifier of data received by the first device equals the source identifier of data sent by the first device, that a failure has occurred in the first transmission medium**”, as stated in Claim 18. Applicants’ claimed invention determines that a failure has occurred when the source identifier, sent by the device, **equals or matches** that which is received at the device. This would occur, for example, when a type of failure has occurred in the transmission medium which would cause a signal sent by a device to be reflected back to the device.

For this particular element of Claim 18, the Office Action cites page 5, paragraph 50 of *Hosler*, apparently indicating the above-mentioned element is taught within this cite, Applicants respectfully disagree. It appears to Applicants that *Hosler* teaches determining a **mismatch** of signature data indicating a need for updating a routing table (see page 2, the second half of paragraph 13 and page 5, lines 8-12 of paragraph 50). A determination based on a mismatch of signature data cannot be equated to a determination based on a sent source identifier equaling or matching a received source identifier. Therefore, for at least this reason, *Hosler* does not teach each and every element of, in the detail and the manner of, Claim 18. Applicants maintain the same argument with regard to Claim 30 which contains similar language.

For at least the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that *Hosler* should be withdrawn as a reference under 35 USC 102.

CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, the foregoing amendment places the Application in condition for allowance. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of the claims be withdrawn and full allowance granted. Should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, please contact Bobby Slaton at (972) 519-2295.

Respectfully submitted,

ALCATEL

/Bobby D. Slaton/

Bobby D. Slaton

Reg. No. 43,130

Dated: August 4, 2006

Alcatel USA
Intellectual Property Department
3400 W. Plano Parkway, M/S LEGL2
Plano, TX 75075
Phone: (972) 519-2295
Fax: (972) 477-9328